

**REMARKS**

**35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1-4, 9, and 14-29, have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has made the necessary corrections to independent claims 1, 9, 20, 24, 26, and 28, and as such these claims should be allowable. In addition, claims 2-4, 14, 16-19, 21-23, 25, 27, and 29 were rejected for incorporating the indefinite limitations presented above. As previously stated the necessary corrections have been made, and as such the preceding dependent claims should be allowable too.

**35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 9, 14, 20-24 and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Simpson. Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 9, 15, 20, 24, 26 and 28. In particular the applicant has further defined the release in these claims, i.e. "said release member having a first base and a second base and a head in the form of an inverted "U". Neither Brown nor Simpson teach or suggest such a configuration. As to dependent claims 2-4, 14, 22, 23 and 27, these claims depend on the preceding amended independent claims and as such the Examiner's should reconsider the rejection of these claims and they should now be in a condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected claims 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Simpson as applied to claims 1-4, 9, 14, 20-24 and 26-28 above, and further in view of Lindstrom et al. For the reasons set forth above, these claims too should now be in condition for allowance.

Application No. 10/623,120

The Examiner has rejected claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Brown in view of Simpson as applied to claims 1-4, 9, 14, 20-24 and 26-28 above, and further in view of Charlton. However, the ring in Charlton, which the Examiner avers would be obvious to one skilled in the art to combine with Brown, is located in near the center. In claim 29 of the applicant's present invention the ring as claimed is located at an end of the spring and as such this configuration is patentably distinguishable from Brown in view of Charlton. For the reasons set forth above, these claims too should now be in condition for allowance.

The applicant has added dependent claims 31 and 32.

### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, applicant's claims are patentable over the cited prior art and the application should be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas A. O'Rourke

Reg. No.: 27,665

BODNER & O'ROURKE, L.L.P.


425 Broadhollow Road

Melville, New York 11747

(631) 249-7500

Application No. 10/623,120  
CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that the foregoing Response was mailed by first class mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this <sup>28<sup>th</sup> August</sup> ~~8<sup>th</sup> June~~ day of ~~June~~, 2006.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thomas A. O'Rourke